

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,245	07/02/2003	Hans Schwade	4C16.1-011	3307
35725 7	590 04/27/2004		EXAMINER	
MEHRMAN LAW OFFICE, P.C.			WILSON, GREGORY A	
ONE PREMIE 5605 GLENRI	R PLAZA DGE DRIVE, STE. 795		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, C	-		3749	-
			DATE MAILED: 04/27/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	$-\lambda \gamma +$				
	10/612,245	JAMEEL ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Gregory A. Wilson	3749					
Th MAILING DATE of this communication		ith the correspond nce address					
Period f r Reply	DI V.IO OET TO EVOIDE - 1	AONTHON FROM					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thi iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communicat BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05	5 April 2004.						
·—	his action is non-final.						
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allo			is				
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I). 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-31 and 33-37 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without							
5) Claim(s) <u>11-20 and 33-37</u> is/are allowed.	Jiawii Iloili Consideration.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,21,27 and 28</u> is/are rejected.							
•							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a							
Applicant may not request that any objection to							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action of John P10-132.	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		Annlination No.					
2. Certified copies of the priority docum3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum							
application from the International Bur		Treceived in this reduction etags					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a		t received.					
American							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date	(08) 5) Notice of 6) Other:	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 3749

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 5, line 35, change "cold" to -could--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 21, and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicants' remarks that the invention overcomes the inconvenience and maintenance involved in plug switching as described in Booher et al and that the lance of the invention can be used to clean with either water or steam without having to remove a device, is not persuasive, since applicant has not claimed a sootblower that switches between water and steam without having to remove a device from or install a device in the sootblower. Booher et al teaches two sets of nozzle types, one for water and one for steam, they are independently controlled and operate as the cleaning requirement dictate. In Figure 4 of Booher et al, a configuration is shown in which nozzles (52, 54) are simultaneously operating, one for ejecting water (nozzle 54) and the other for ejecting steam (nozzle 52).

Art Unit: 3749

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 21, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Booher et al (5,509,607). Booher et al discloses a sootblower (10) for cleaning internal structures of combustion devices (ie: boilers) and includes a lance tube (14) having two separately controlled cleaning fluid applicators (nozzles 52, 54), the lance rotates as it delivers cleaning fluid (SEE column 3, lines 61-63), a drive system (SEE column 4, lines 8-13), a control system (SEE column 5, lines 6-9), a steam tube (16) on which the lance tube is telescopically received, multiple steam nozzles (Figure 3) for directing steam out of the lance tube, a steam valve (38) for controlling the delivery of steam, and a carriage (18) propelled by the drive system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Booher et al (5,509,607) in view of Carter et al (5,096,502). Booher et al discloses the applicant's primary inventive concept as stated above, but does not particularly teach a boiler monitoring equipment including a boiler camera which works with the control system to activate the sootblower to perform a cleaning operation. Carter et al teaches an automatic cleaning system (lance control system) monitoring equipment which derives the furnace wall emissivity (which represents an unclean furnace, ie: ash accumulation), the water lance is initiated (SEE column 2, lines 17-25) by a sensor on a furnace wall, a control system receives signal from sensor which automatically activates the water lance to clean boiler interior and in an alternative embodiment, Carter et al discloses a boiler camera to measure wall reflectivity or temperature, this in turn is used to control operation of the water lance (SEE column 2, lines 8-16). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains to have modified the sootblower lance tube of **Booher** et al to include a boiler camera as taught by Carter et al for the purpose of observing the conditions in a boiler during cleaning.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-20 and 33-37 are allowed.

Claims 3-10, 22-26 and 29-31 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/612,245 Page 5

Art Unit: 3749

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory A. Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 308-1239. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 am - 4:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on (703)308-1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GREGORY WILSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Gaw April 25, 2004